

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/778,052

Applicant

STEINHAUS

Examiner

Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee

Art Unit

1714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee.

(3) Mr. Thomas Steinhousler.

(2) MR. Tom Hodge.

(4) Mr. Thomas Folda.

Date of Interview: 10 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 5, 12, 15 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In order for the affidavit to be effective in overcoming the prior art of Heel the applicants have agreed to incorporate limitation of claims 4, 5 into 1 and claims 15, 16 into 12. The amendment would remove 102(b) rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required